December 24, 2025

INSIDER REPORT

A publication of *The New American*

Edited by William F. Jasper

Inside this issue:

- **DOJ Illegally Withholding Epstein Files. What's Next?**
- **Virginia's Deep State Deepens With Spanberger Appointment of Meador**
- **Report: Federal Workforce Down Nine Percent in 2025, but Spending Continued to Grow**
- **Offshore Wind Cancelled Due to National Security Threats**
- **Australia: Is "OzExit" a Real Possibility?**
- **New Czech Environment Minister Goes to War Against Climate Agenda**
- **Outlawing Christmas**
- **The Christmas Truces of 1914: Peace in the Midst of War**
- **Gifts for the Interesting People in Your Life**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

DOJ Illegally Withholding Epstein Files. What's Next?

Congress required the Department of Justice (DOJ) to release all of the Epstein files no later than 30 days after enactment of the Epstein Files Transparency Act (H.R. 4405) on November 19. That deadline fell on December 19, and although the DOJ released a cache of files on that date, it failed to release all of them. The DOJ claims that there were simply too many documents to review. But others say that the partial release was selective, including Congressmen Ro Khanna (D-Calif.), who sponsored H.R. 4405, and cosponsor Thomas Massie (R-Ky.), who led the discharge-petition effort to get the bill to the House floor for a vote.

The day prior to the December 19 deadline, Massie released a video explaining how we'd know if the DOJ were complying with the law. "One of the ways we'll know is there are people who have covered this case for years, and I've talked to them in private, and they know what some of the material is that's back there," he said. "But the other way that we're going to know is the victims' lawyers have been in contact with me, and collectively they know there are at least 20 names of men who are accused of sex crimes in the possession of the FBI…. So if we get a large production on December 19 and it does not contain a single name of any male who's accused of a sex crime, or sex trafficking, or rape, or any of these things, then we know they haven't produced all the documents. It's that simple."

Of course, we did "get a large production on December 19th," and Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche even announced earlier that day that more documents would be forthcoming. Yet after searching the partial release, which was in a publicly searchable format, for key information, Massie and Khanna quickly determined that the DOJ was not complying with the law, and they said so publicly.

Two days after the December 19 deadline, Massie and Khanna appeared jointly on the CBS Sunday news program *Face the Nation*, where Massie accused the DOJ of "flouting" both "the spirit and the letter of the law." He added, "It's very troubling the posture that they've taken. And I won't be satisfied until the survivors are satisfied. You know, I said in the hours leading up to this release that we will know if they are complying, if they implicate any of the other criminals that are involved and the suspects that are involved …

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2025 by *The New American*

and they've never been mentioned."

Khanna said on *Face the Nation* that the release "was a slap in the face of survivors."

"What do they want?" he asked rhetorically. "They want to know who are the rich and powerful men who visited Epstein's rape island and covered up the abuse and the key documents that our law basically said needed to be released. The 60-count indictment that actually implicates a lot of these people and the prosecution memo were not released. It's not about the timeline, it's about the selective concealment."

There are documents, and there are documents. But not only were the most important documents not included in the selective release, according to Massie and Khanna, but even documents that were released were excessively redacted. In fact, CBS News reported that even though "the Justice Department released thousands of new records on convicted sex offender Jeffrey Epstein" on December 19, "at least 550 pages in the documents were *fully redacted* in the initial release." (Emphasis added.)

Massie and Khanna fully intend to get the truth out. But how? Massie said on *Face the Nation* that "the quickest way, and I think most expeditious way, to get justice for these victims is to bring inherent contempt against [Attorney General] Pam Bondi, and Ro Khanna and I are talking about and drafting that right now." Regarding the prospects of getting this accomplished in Congress, Khanna noted that "we only need the House for inherent contempt, and we're building a bipartisan coalition, and it would fine Pam Bondi for every day that she's not releasing these documents."

Should the DOJ continue to flout the law, what are the prospects of this actually happening? They may be better than many pundits and pols may think! Let us not forget that despite the opposition of President Donald Trump and the Republican congressional leadership, Massie was able to get H.R. 4405 onto the House floor, where it was quickly passed with only one dissenting vote. It was also swiftly passed by the Senate and then signed into law by Trump. — Gary Benoit

Virginia's Deep State Deepens With Spanberger Appointment of Meador

Virginia's Democratic Governor-elect Abigail Spanberger has displayed incredible audacity with her nomination of Stanley Meador to be the next Virginia secretary for public safety and homeland security. The choice provides a jarring indication of the radical agenda that Spanberger, a former CIA agent, intends to pursue in her administration. Stanley Meador was the Special Agent in Charge (SAC) of the FBI's Richmond, Virginia, office that issued the infamous FBI memo targeting "radical-traditionalist Catholics."

In June, Meador was one of many agents fired, demoted, or put on leave by new FBI Director Kash Patel. *The New York Times* rushed to their defense, of course, characterizing the dismissals as "retaliation" and "politicization" of the Bureau. The *Times* story on June 5, 2025 claimed that the agents were targeted on an "enemies list" of FBI employees who were being purged for not being personally loyal to Donald Trump. Here are the opening paragraphs of the *Times* story, titled "*As Ousters Continue, F.B.I. Singles Out Employee Over Friendship With Trump Critic:*

The F.B.I. has targeted another round of employees who ran afoul of conservatives, forcing out two veteran agents in Virginia — one of whom is friends with a critic of President Trump — and punishing another in Las Vegas, according to several people familiar with the matter.

> Two of the men, Spencer Evans and Stanley Meador, are senior agents who ran F.B.I. field offices in Las Vegas and Richmond, Va. The third, Michael Feinberg, a top deputy in the Norfolk, Va.,

> office, had ties to a former agent whom Kash Patel, the F.B.I. director, identified in his book as part of the so-called deep state.
>
> The moves add to the transfers, ousters and demotions that have rippled across the F.B.I. as Mr. Patel and Dan Bongino, his No. 2, promise to remake the country's premier law enforcement agency. The wave of changes, current and former agents say, amount to little more than retaliation, underscoring what they describe as the politicization of the F.B.I. as its leaders seek to mollify Mr. Trump's supporters.

Naturally, the *Times'* spin purposely ignores the facts concerning the agents' egregious actions, including their participation in the illegal, unconstitutional, and immoral weaponization of the FBI against President Donald Trump and his advisors, appointees, and supporters. More on that down below, but first, back to Governor-elect Spanberger.

Click here to continue reading this article, authored by William F. Jasper.

Report: Federal Workforce Down Nine Percent in 2025, but Spending Continued to Grow

According to a newly released report, the Trump administration has significantly cut the number of federal employees while continuing the steady — and unsustainable — growth in federal spending.

The report, authored by Alex Nowrasteh and Krit Chanwong of the Cato Institute, states that the administration, led by the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), carried out the largest reduction in the federal workforce "since the military demobilizations at the end of World War II and the Korean War," but failed to make any dent in federal expenditures.

Turning first to federal spending, Nowrasteh and Chanwong note:

> The federal government spent $7.6 trillion in the first 11 months of calendar year 2025, approximately $248 billion higher by November of 2025 compared to the same month in 2024 (Figure 1). Cumulative spending in every month of 2025 was greater than in every other year and was approximately as much as the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected in June 2024, or slightly less in real terms. There is no visible structural break in 2025 spending that coincides with DOGE's start date. An observer who did not know when DOGE started could not identify it in Figure 1.

As an indicator of how large the federal deficit and overall spending are, the national debt grew $1 trillion — surpassing the $38-trillion mark — in just two-and-a-half months (August to October 2025).

Despite the continued growth in federal spending, Nowrasteh and Chanwong note that the federal workforce's size has declined significantly this year:

> Although DOGE didn't reduce outlays by November, it sizably cut federal employment by 271,000 (Figure 2). That's a nine percent decline since January 2025. DOGE brought down federal employment to late 2014 levels in less than 10 months, but with almost 60 percent of the decline in October. Figure 3 compares the monthly change in federal employment during the Biden administration and President Trump's second term, while Figure 4 measures reductions in Trump's 2025 workforce against previous presidents. The pace of workforce reduction was unusually rapid and is on track to exceed Clinton-era cumulative reductions in roughly one year rather than four, if sustained. By the end of September, federal employment had fallen by almost 100,000. The sharp October drop of over 150,000 was driven by the federal civil service buyout offer

> rather than normal attrition. The number of employees continued to fall in November, but at a slower pace. We won't see a single month of federal employment decline that resembles October 2025 for the rest of the Trump administration.

Why the disparity between the federal workforce and spending data? Nowrasteh and Chanwong explain:

> DOGE failed to cut spending because most federal spending was for entitlement programs, where spending remains high due to structural reasons and policy autopilot. Congress alone has the authority to cut these programs, so it's unsurprising that DOGE did not reduce spending….
>
> It is not surprising that such a large reduction in the federal workforce did not lead to lower outlays, since most federal expenditures are transfer payments rather than salaries. According to Cato's report to the DOGE Commission last year, a 10 percent cut in the federal workforce would only save about $40 billion annually. The 3.8 million federal defense and nondefense employees, excluding postal workers, account for around 8 percent of total spending.

Although the Trump administration has made notable cuts to the federal workforce, it has failed to meaningfully cut the many existing (and unconstitutional) federal programs, as Nowrasteh and Chanwong point out — and substantial reductions can only come via congressional legislation. Importantly, mandatory spending — on programs such as Social Security and Medicare, which Congress does not need to regularly reauthorize — consists of nearly three-fourths of all federal spending, but Republicans have rejected substantial cuts in this area. In order to reduce federal spending, Congress must eliminate these unconstitutional programs.

Additionally, as Nowrasteh and Chanwong noted above, despite the substantial federal-workforce cuts, the number of federal employees remains at "late 2014 levels," or about 2.7 million employees. Although this is an improvement over January 2025 levels, the federal workforce is still large enough to run the myriad unconstitutional federal programs.

In order to reduce the size and scope of the federal government, Congress must act by both repealing and refusing to fund all unconstitutional programs. Additionally, state governments can act by nullifying unconstitutional federal programs and refusing federal money, which is overwhelmingly used to promote big-government programs. Urge your U.S. representative and senators to slash all unconstitutional spending, and urge your state legislators to nullify all unconstitutional federal acts. — Peter Rykowski

Offshore Wind Cancelled Due to National Security Threats

The Trump administration is suspending leases for five wind farms under construction off the U.S. east coast, as U.S. Interior Secretary Doug Burgum told Fox Business News on Monday.

"Today we're sending notification to the five large offshore wind projects that are under construction, that their leases will be suspended due to national security concerns," he said. "The Department of War has come back conclusively that the issues related to these large offshore wind programs have created radar interference that creates a genuine risk for the U.S., particularly related to where they are in proximity to our east coast population centers."'

The action is "effective immediately," according to an Interior Department memo, though the national security risks entailed are part of "completely classified reports." In a quote included in the memo, Burgum only hinted

that they involve "the rapid evolution of the relevant adversary technologies." However, the statement went on to explain that unclassified government studies "have long found that the movement of massive turbine blades and the highly reflective towers create radar interference called 'clutter,'" which "obscures legitimate moving targets and generates false targets in the vicinity of the wind projects."

Affected leases are:

1. Vineyard Wind 1 (off Massachusetts, partially operational)
2. Revolution Wind (off Rhode Island and Connecticut)
3. Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind (largest of the projects)
4. Sunrise Wind (off New York)
5. Empire Wind 1 (off New York)

Block Island Wind Farm off the coast of Rhode Island has been operational since 2016, and South Fork Wind Farm off the coast of Long Island has been operating since 2024. Neither is affected by Burgum's announcement. — Rebecca Terrell

Australia: Is "OzExit" a Real Possibility?

"OzExit," the proposed withdrawal of Australia from the United Nations, has been a fringe political talking point

Down Under for at least a decade. Now, with the leftist lunacy of the Albanese government driving Australia closer to socioeconomic ruin, Queensland Senator Pauline Hanson, founder and leader of Australia's One Nation party and that country's counterpart to MTG, has introduced a $90 billion proposal to "save Australia" that would not only withdraw Australia from the UN, it also contemplates withdrawal from WHO and the World Economic Forum, as well as eliminating Australia's Department of Climate Change (yes, Australia actually has such a department) and making deep cuts into the NDIS (Australia's national welfare program). The proposal has generated a lot of excitement, and has propelled the One Nation party, a sort of Aussie version of MAGA that was founded in 2016, to new levels of popularity, if the polls are given any credence. One Nation is still a far cry from MAGA or the U.K.'s Reform Party, but it has now reached a 19-percent approval rating, with far higher percentages in conservative, self-reliant rural areas, including much of Queensland.

Hanson's plan actually intends to save $90 billion per year in wasteful government spending, and to return a portion of the savings to Australians. It also proposes building more coal power plants to save energy prices, and to build more railways and dams. Although One Nation's platform is still a minority position, it is, as far as we are aware, the only major proposal to get out of the United Nations outside the United States. Not even Milei's Argentina, for all of its opposition to globalism, has advanced such a proposal. Should Australia's situation continue to deteriorate and One Nation eventually morph into a majority movement, it is possible that Australia and not the United States will become the first country to leave the UN. — Steve Bonta

New Czech Environment Minister Goes to War Against Climate Agenda

Petr Macinka, the Czech Republic's new environment minister, has started his tenure by eliminating his ministry's climate-protection section, consistent with his outspoken skepticism of radical climate-change ideology.

Politico reports:

> Macinka had promised ahead of the country's Oct. 3-4 election that "green blood will run," and on taking office Monday announced that "the climate crisis is over today."
>
> "In the new staffing structure of the Ministry of the Environment that we are preparing for January 1, 2026, the climate protection section is no longer included," Macinka wrote on social media Thursday evening [December 18].

Macinka, who also leads the conservative Motorists for Themselves (AUTO) party, has previously spoken against radical climate-change ideology. From *Politico*:

> Petr Macinka … made a bold symbolic entrance when meeting the president on Oct. 6 in a massive Ram 1500 pickup, signaling his opposition to the EU's Green Deal and the 2035 combustion engine ban.
>
> Last year, Macinka said that if his party makes it into the government "green blood will run," and recently stated that "the idea that humans are the sole cause of climate change is funny."
>
> He wants to leave the Paris climate agreement and roll back protection for the Soutok protected landscape area, part of the so-called Moravian Amazon.

Macinka and his AUTO party entered the Czech government via a coalition agreement with Prime Minister Andrej Babiš' populist ANO party and the conservative Freedom and Direct Democracy (SPD) party. As the *Insider Report* previously reported, the three parties won the country's parliamentary elections on October 3-4, replacing a more liberal government.

It is unclear how long Macinka, who concurrently serves as foreign minister, will hold the position of environment minister. He is currently serving in the latter position on an interim basis, since fellow AUTO member Filip Turek, whom Babiš proposed to serve as environment minister, was hospitalized with a herniated disc. Turek is also under police investigation for claims of sexual assault and hate speech — the Czech Republic, like most European countries, criminalizes "hate speech" — so it is unclear whether President Petr Pavel will ultimately appoint him to the position.

Regardless, Macinka's first actions in office are an encouraging development in a country that is relatively committed — by European standards — to individual freedom and limited government. — Peter Rykowski

Outlawing Christmas

You may think that Christmas is "the most wonderful time of the year," but not everyone throughout history has agreed.

In Colonial New England, for example, Puritans outlawed its observance. This group of English Calvinists saw itself as purifying Christianity from corrupt traditions. They targeted many established holidays, but Christmas drew particular ire.

Records from that period in Massachusetts include a 1659 ban: "Whosoever shall be found observing any such day as Christmas or the like, either by forbearing of

#1
Veterinarian Recommended Brand
COSEQUIN®
JOINT HEALTH SUPPLEMENT
Cosequin® has a variety of formulas to help support your pet's healthy joints and cartilage.
Visit WWW.COSEQUIN.COM
nutramax LABORATORIES VETERINARY SCIENCES, INC.

labor, feasting or any other way … shall pay for every such offense five shillings."

In his *Testimony Against Several Prophane and Superstitious Customs*, Puritan clergyman Increase Mather explained the rationale. He condemned Christmas celebrations as pagan, unscriptural, and man-made, even attacking the holiday tradition of "wassailing," in which the poor petitioned food and drink from the wealthy. He called Christmas a "popish observance," pointing out that the name itself derives from Catholicism's "Christ's Mass."

But how, you may ask, is Christmas "unscriptural"? Though the Bible accurately describes the historical timing and circumstances of Christ's nativity, as well as gifts brought by the three Magi, it does not specifically name December 25 as Jesus' birthday. This was enough to make characteristically strict Puritans decry the feast, identifying Christmas as a human invention and therefore a form of idolatry.

Moreover, the early Church, Puritans alleged, had deliberately overlaid Christian meaning onto heathen customs to promote conversions. December 25 coincides with the ancient Roman festival of Saturnalia, a time of feasting, gift-giving, and revelry. That claim is corroborated in secular sources, but isn't it a wise course for the Church to have adopted? Consider that conversion to Christianity would have meant an incredible upheaval of pagan culture embedded in the ancient world. Think how difficult it would be to extract Christmas from our modern times in favor of 17th-century Puritan practices, and you will have an idea of the situation facing the early Church. Causing feast days to coincide with established customs eased the transition from profane to sacred.

Interestingly, Puritan arguments ignored the symbolic placement of Christmas on December 25 and its interplay with other related feast days and natural events. December 25 corresponds with the winter solstice, when nights are longest and days shortest. The "Light of the World" came into the world at its darkest moment, and from then, His light continues to increase, just as the days of the year become longer. Contrarywise, the birth of Saint John the Baptist, commemorated on June 24, relates to the summer solstice, when days start to become shorter. In this way, the calendar reflects the statement of Jesus' Biblical precursor: "He must increase, but I must decrease." Moreover, the Catholic Church observes the conception of Jesus on March 25, the feast of the Annunciation of the Angel Gabriel to Mary (as recorded in the first Gospel of Saint Luke), exactly nine months before Christmas. It is a date that corresponds to the vernal equinox, and at the autumnal equinox, the nativity of Saint John the Baptist is commemorated.

Nevertheless, in England, Puritan-dominated Parliament banned Christmas in the 1640s and 1650s, closing churches on December 25 and treating it as a regular workday. In New England, where Puritans held sway, the Massachusetts General Court formalized the prohibition of 1659. The law fined anyone five shillings for observing the day "by forbearing of labor, feasting, or any other way," aiming to prevent "disorders" and superstition. The ban lasted until 1681, when English royal authority forced its repeal, though cultural disdain

has survived and is still seen in modern attacks on the Holy Day. — Rebecca Terrell

The Christmas Truces of 1914: Peace in the Midst of War

In 1914, when the bulk of the soldiers on both sides of World War I were Christian and Christmastime rolled around, fighting ceased, despite orders from superiors.

The fighting came to a halt for many of the troops along the Western Front on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day in 1914. Most historians refer to this event as the Christmas Truce of 1914. But it wasn't a single truce negotiated by diplomats at the highest levels of the governments involved. The Christmas Truces of 1914 were negotiated informally by the troops themselves, most of whom were Christians who sincerely believed they were fighting for a just cause, regardless of which side they were on. But no matter how noble they viewed their cause, they did not want to engage in the slaughter of their fellow human beings on the Holy Day.

Some of the truces were just a head nod in agreement not to fight for a day, while many involved fraternization, meaning the troops visited with each other. There were hundreds of these individual truces, perhaps even a thousand.

There were reliable reports of Christmas Truces along the Western Front from Messines, Belgium, passing east of Armentières to Richebourg, France, a distance of about 20 miles. There were also sporadic reports of similar truces in other locations. Estimates of participation run as high as tens of thousands of soldiers. It was the largest informal truce in recorded history.

One of the truces is known to have lasted only a half hour. Many of them lasted for days or weeks after Christmas. Some of the truces ended abruptly, with hostilities resuming immediately. Others ended reluctantly. The truce in the Ploegsteert Wood, Belgium area, one where the troops resisted resuming hostilities, persisted through March of 1915.

"The war will be over by Christmas," the soldiers of both sides were told. Germany's Kaiser Wilhelm II addressed some departing troops in August of 1914 saying, "You will be home before the leaves fall from the trees." The leaves fell. Many soldiers fell. As Christmas was fast approaching it became obvious the war would not be over by Christmas. Pope Benedict XV attempted to arrange a truce at Christmas, but his efforts were unsuccessful. Failing on that, the pope tried another diplomatic attempt — an exchange of prisoners of war. This request, as well as his previous message to "Lay down your arms," fell largely on deaf ears.

While peace efforts were failing, the men fighting the war were making preparations for celebrating Christmas as best they could under the circumstances. With the exception of some units from India augmenting the British side and some units from Algeria augmenting the French side, the vast majority of the troops on both sides came from strong Christian cultures where Christmas was a major religious holiday.

This is an excerpt from an article written by Kurt Hyde and published in The New American magazine on the 100th anniversary of the Christmas War Truces. Continue reading here.

Gifts for the Interesting People in Your Life

It might be an ironic source, but Vice.com is adding some quirky Christmas cheer to this holiday season with a list of "What to Get Your Favorite Conspiracy Theorist This Season."

The list is for those who are "die-hard, paranoid, skeptical," and hard-to-shop-for.

Gifts range from the Bigfoot Research Kit, to a tinfoil bucket hat, to a soil sample from the site of the 1947 "UFO crash landing" in Roswell, New Mexico.

The most clever and timely by far, however, is a Christmas ornament that bears an image of Jeffrey

Epstein with the caption, “This Ornament Didn’t Hang Itself.”

Of course, it’s too late for any online Christmas shopping if you want anything to put under the tree, but for future reference we can offer more substantive ideas than those listed above. For people in your life who are *conspiracy fact-finders*, Western Islands Publishing is reprinting timeless titles such as James Perloff’s *The Shadows of Power* and *Fabian Freeway* by Rose L. Martin.

You can find these and all available titles at WesternIslandsPublishing.com. There may not be time to ship before the holiday, but after all, there are 12 days of Christmas, and the Infant Jesus had to wait until January 6 to receive His gifts. — Rebecca Terrell

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

New York Times Declares War on Homeschooling

Khanna, Massie Warn That AG Bondi Might Face Contempt of Congress Action for Not Releasing All Epstein Files

Cowed by the Left, Chick-fil-A Stands by DEI Despite Culture Shift

Peter Schiff: Don’t Believe the Happy Talk on the Economy

HHS to Immigrant Sponsors: Pay What You Owe for Immigrants Who Use Medicaid or Face Collection

Judge Denies Schara Motion for New Medical Freedom Trial

TPUSA’s Top Historian Explains Communist and Islamic Infiltration of U.S.

Should the European Union Be Dissolved?

[END]